



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/972,994	10/10/2001	Eric Majani	1807.1874	4775
5514	7590	09/13/2004	EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO			DO, CHAT C	
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			ART UNIT	
NEW YORK, NY 10112			PAPER NUMBER	

2124

DATE MAILED: 09/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/972,994

Applicant(s)

MAJANI, ERIC

Examiner

Chat C. Do

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/10/01; 01/10/02; 04/05/02.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 7, 9-13, 15, 16, 18, 21-23, 25-29, 31, 32, 34-38, 40, 41, 43, 46-48, 50-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 8, 14, 17, 19, 20, 24, 30, 33, 39, 42, 44, 45 and 49 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/10/02.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract is written in more than one paragraph and it contains legal phraseology in lines 6 and 8. ~~Correction is required. See~~ MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

3. Claims 3, 10, 12, 15, 18-19, 25, 28, 37, 44, 50, 51, 54-59 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Re claim 3, the examiner considers claim 3 is dependent on claim 1.

Re claim 12, the examiner considers claim 12 is dependent on claim 10.

Re claim 19, the examiner considers claim 19 is dependent on claim 10.

Re claim 25, the examiner considers claim 25 is dependent on claim 10.

Re claim 28, the examiner considers claim 28 is dependent on claim 26.

Re claim 37, the examiner considers claim 37 is dependent on claim 35.

Art Unit: 2124

Re claim 44, the examiner considers claim 44 is dependent on claim 35.

Re claim 50, the examiner considers claim 50 is dependent on claim 35.

Re claim 51, the examiner considers claim 51 is dependent on claim 35.

Re claim 54, the examiner considers claim 54 is dependent on claim 1.

Re claim 55, the examiner considers claim 55 is dependent on claim 35.

Re claim 56, the examiner considers claim 56 is dependent on claim 1.

Re claim 57, the examiner considers claim 57 is dependent on claim 26.

Re claim 58, the examiner considers claim 58 is dependent on claim 1.

Re claim 59, the examiner considers claim 59 is dependent on claim 1.

These claims 10, 15, and 18 have exact limitations cited in claims 1, 6, and 9 respectively. Therefore, the applicant is advised to amend or cancel the claims to avoid redundant.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 6, 15, 21-23, 31, 40, and 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Re claim 6, the limitation “alternately a sample of rank immediately below or immediately above the adjacent even sample” in line 3 is unclear to a point that the

Art Unit: 2124

examiner cannot interpret broadly. For examination purposes, the examiner disregards this limitation in the claim. Claims 15, 31, and 40 have the same problem.

Re claim 21, the limitation "the variable" in lines 2-3 lacks an antecedence basis. For examination purposes, the examiner considers the variable would be any number. Claims 22-23 and 46-48 have the same problem.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-13, 15-16, 18, 24-29, 31-32, 34-38, 40-41, 43, and 50-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ortega et al. (U.S. 6,757,343)

Re claim 1, Ortega et al. disclose in Figures 1 and 3-4 a filtering method for transforming an input digital signal into one or more output digital signals (title) having even-indexed samples and odd-indexed samples (Figure 3 with input shift by unit in order to be odd) method including at least one iteration (Figure 1 with 3 iterations) comprising the steps of: modifying the even-indexed samples by a function of weighted odd-indexed samples (output filter of y_0 wherein the input is the even-index sample entering h_1 as odd-indexed coefficient), and modifying the odd-indexed samples by a function of weighted even-indexed samples (output filter of 130 wherein the input is the

odd-index sample entering h_0 as even-indexed coefficient), wherein the weighted samples are obtained by at least one weighting operation applied to a difference between two consecutive even-indexed samples (Figure 4 wherein α is obtained and applied to only even-index sample).

Re claim 2, Ortega et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3-4 a step of modifying the odd-indexed samples is performed after step of modifying the even indexed samples (Figure 4 in the second step at T2).

Re claim 3, Ortega et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3-4 iteration further comprises: weighting (process of outputting odd-indexed sample at 120), by a first weighting coefficient (h_0), at least one odd-indexed sample adjacent to an even-indexed sample currently being modified, so as to obtain a weighted odd-indexed sample (output of 130 after down-sample), modifying at least one even-indexed sample using the at least one weighted odd-indexed sample, weighting (process of outputting odd-indexed sample at 110), by a second weighting coefficient (h_1), even-indexed samples adjacent to an odd-indexed sample currently being modified, so as to obtain weighted even-indexed samples (output of 130 after down-sample), and modifying at least one odd-indexed sample using at least one weighted even-indexed sample.

Re claim 4, Ortega et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3-4 the second weighting coefficient is a function of the first weighting coefficient (inherently feature for stable condition).

Re claim 6, Ortega et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3-4 at each iteration, an odd-indexed sample adjacent to an even sample currently being modified (Figure 1) is

Art Unit: 2124

alternately a sample of rank immediately below or immediately above the adjacent even sample.

Re claim 7, Ortega et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3-4 at the end of iteration, an additional step of filtering that includes weighting by a third weighting coefficient (Figure 3 with addition of another coefficients h_{10} or h_{01}).

Re claim 9, Ortega et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3-4 the digital input signal represents an image (col. 1 lines 15-17).

Re claim 10, it has same limitations cited in claim 1. Thus, claim 10 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 1.

Re claim 11, Ortega et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3-4 step of modifying even-indexed samples is performed after step of modifying odd-indexed samples (Figure 3 with T3).

Re claim 12, it has similar limitation as cited in claim 3 wherein it occurs in the subsequence iteration. Thus, claim 12 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 3.

Re claim 13, it has same limitations cited in claim 4. Thus, claim 13 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 4.

Re claim 14, it has same limitations cited in claim 5. Thus, claim 14 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 5.

Re claim 15, it has same limitations cited in claim 6. Thus, claim 15 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 6.

Re claim 16, it has same limitations cited in claim 7. Thus, claim 16 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 7.

Re claim 17, it has same limitations cited in claim 8. Thus, claim 17 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 8.

Re claim 18, it has same limitations cited in claim 9. Thus, claim 18 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 9.

Re claim 25, Ortega et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3-4 means adapted to implement a filtering method (Figure 11).

Re claim 26, Ortega et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3-4 a digital filtering device adapted to transform an input digital signal into one or more output digital signals (abstract) containing even-indexed samples and odd-indexed samples (Figure 3),
filtering device comprising: at least one weighting module (Figure 11 P(z)); and means for modifying even-indexed samples by a function of weighted odd-indexed samples (output 110), wherein weighted samples are supplied by at least one weighting module, modification means functioning iteratively, so as to modify even-indexed samples at least once and then odd-indexed samples at least once (col. 6 lines 25-35 with update filter), and at least one weighting module receives as an input the difference between two consecutive even-indexed samples.

Re claim 27, it has means limitations cited in claim 2. Thus, claim 27 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 2.

Re claim 28, it has means limitations cited in claim 3. Thus, claim 28 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 3.

Re claim 29, it has means limitations cited in claim 4. Thus, claim 29 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 4.

Re claim 30, it has means limitations cited in claim 5. Thus, claim 30 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 5.

Re claim 31, it has means limitations cited in claim 6. Thus, claim 31 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 6.

Re claim 32, it has means limitations cited in claim 7. Thus, claim 32 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 7.

Re claim 33, it has means limitations cited in claim 8. Thus, claim 33 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 8.

Re claim 34, it has means limitations cited in claim 9. Thus, claim 34 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 9.

Re claim 35, Ortega et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3-4 a digital filtering device adapted to transform one or more input digital signals into an output digital signal (abstract), the input signals containing even-indexed samples and odd-indexed samples (Figure 3), filtering device comprising: at least one weighting means (Figure 11 with $P(z)$); means for modifying odd-indexed samples by a function of weighted even-indexed samples (Figure 1 with output of 120); and means for modifying even-indexed samples by a function of weighted odd-indexed samples (Figure 1 with output of 110), wherein weighted samples are supplied by at least one weighting means ($P(z)$), modification means functions iteratively, so as to modify odd-indexed samples at least once and then even-indexed samples at least once (col. 6 lines 25-35 with updated filter),

and wherein at least one weighting means receives as an input the difference between two consecutive even-indexed samples.

Re claim 36, it has means limitations cited in claim 11. Thus, claim 36 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 11.

Re claim 37, it has means limitations cited in claim 12. Thus, claim 37 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 12.

Re claim 38, it has means limitations cited in claim 13. Thus, claim 38 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 13.

Re claim 39, it has means limitations cited in claim 14. Thus, claim 39 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 14.

Re claim 40, it has means limitations cited in claim 15. Thus, claim 40 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 15.

Re claim 41, it has means limitations cited in claim 16. Thus, claim 41 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 16.

Re claim 42, it has means limitations cited in claim 17. Thus, claim 42 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 17.

Re claim 43, it has means limitations cited in claim 18. Thus, claim 43 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 18.

Re claim 50, it has means limitations cited in claim 25. Thus, claim 50 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 25.

Re claim 51, Ortega et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3-4 at least two digital filtering devices the output signal of one of the digital filtering devices being the input signal of the other digital filtering device (Figure 4 wherein each T is a filter device).

Re claim 52, it is a digital apparatus claim of claim 25. Thus, claim 52 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 25.

Re claim 53, it is a photographic apparatus claim of claim 25. Thus, claim 52 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 25.

Re claim 54, it has same limitations cited in claim 25. Thus, claim 54 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 25.

Re claim 55, Ortega et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3-4 an encoding device comprising at least one filtering device (Figure 4 wherein each T is a filter device).

Re claim 56, Ortega et al. further disclose in Figures 1 and 3-4 the above method is used as digital compression (Figure 1 wherein only the lower bank is filter iteratively for compressing the upper part).

Re claim 57, it has same limitations cited in claim 55. Thus, claim 57 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 55.

Re claim 58, it is an information storage, which stores a program of the filter as cited claim 1. Thus, claim 58 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 1.

Re claim 59, it is a computer program product claim of claim 1. Thus, claim 59 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 1.

Re claim 60, it has same limitations cited in claim 52. Thus, claim 60 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 52.

Re claim 61, it has same limitations cited in claim 53. Thus, claim 61 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 53.

Re claim 62, it has same limitations cited in claim 50. Thus, claim 62 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 50.

Re claim 63, it has same limitations cited in claim 53. Thus, claim 63 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 53.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 5, 8, 14, 17, 19-20, 24, 30, 33, 39, 42, 44-45, and 49 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. Claims 21-23 and 46-48 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. U.S. Patent No. 4,974,187 to Lawton discloses a modular digital signal processing system.

Art Unit: 2124

- b. U.S. Patent No. 6,553,396 to Fukuhara et al. disclose a filter bank constituting method and filter bank apparatus.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chat C. Do whose telephone number is (703) 305-5655. The examiner can normally be reached on M => F from 7:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chaki Kakali can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chat C. Do
Examiner
Art Unit 2124

September 2, 2004

Chaki Kakali

**KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**